

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 2 January 2004. Responsive to that Office Action, Claims 1 – 11 are now cancelled from this case, and Claims 18 – 33 are newly-inserted for further prosecution. It is believed that such newly-inserted claims now clarify the recitations of the originally-filed Claims 1 – 11 (now cancelled), correcting and removing the numerous informalities noted by the Examiner thereagainst.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 – 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner stated that the Claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U. S. practice. The Examiner specifically noted numerous instances of awkward and unclear wording due to grammatical and idiomatic errors.

As mentioned, Claims 1 – 11 are now cancelled from this case. It is believed that newly-inserted Claims 18 – 33 now obviate the Examiner's formal concerns under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Also in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Feldman reference. Because of the numerous informalities found in Claim 1 as originally filed, the Examiner, in setting forth

this substantive rejection, interpreted the Claim as being drawn very generally “to a method of applying metal particles to a fiber structure under vacuum.”

Newly-inserted independent Claim 18 now clarifies the recitation of Applicants’ method of fabricating a metallized fabric to include in its combination of steps such features as establishing within a high vacuum space a “fiber matrix including at least one planarly extended open grid layer,” and “defining a flow path transversely through said open grid layer of said fiber matrix.” The method further includes such features as “exciting a flow of metal particles along said flow path against said fiber matrix to accumulate a metallic structure thereon,” wherein “at least a portion of said metal particles attach[] to said fiber matrix.” This flow of metal particles is excited by a certain pre-selected process, as Claim 18 further clarifies.

The full combination of these and other features now more clearly recited by newly-inserted independent Claim 18 are nowhere disclosed by the cited Feldman reference. That reference merely discloses an insulated heat shield for wrapping a catalytic converter 13. The heat shield is formed by a multi-layered fabric 20 whose outer layers 21, 22 are simply coated with a reflective titanium outer surface. Nowhere does the reference disclose or even suggest such features as using a “fiber matrix” having “at least one planarly extended open grid layer” and “defining a flow path transversely through said open grid layer,” much less “to

MR1197-505

Serial Number: 10/046,090

Reply to Office Action dated 2 January 2004

accumulate a metallic structure thereon," by exciting a flow of metal particles along the flow path, as Claim 18 recites.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the cited Feldman reference fails to disclose the unique combination of elements recited by Applicants' newly-pending Claims for the purposes and objectives disclosed in the subject Patent Application.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
FOR: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



Jun Y. Lee
Registration #40,262

Dated: 3/30/2004

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678



04586
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE